





Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection (Check only those areas evaluated)

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Name(s) and Signature(s) of Inspector(s) | Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers | Date |
| Sandra Brozusky  | EPA/OCE/206-553-5317 | 07/06/16 |
| Joseph Roberto | EPA/OCE/206-553-1669 | |
| | | |
| Signature of Management Q A Reviewer | Agency/Office/Phone and Fax Numbers | Date |
|  | EPA/OCE/13-0955 | 7/27/16 |

7/16/16

INSTRUCTIONS

Section A: National Data System Coding (i.e., PCS)

Column 1: Transaction Code: Use N, C, or D for New, Change, or Delete. All inspections will be *new* unless there is an error in the data entered.

Columns 3-11: NPDES Permit No. Enter the facility's NPDES permit number - third character in permit number indicates permit type for U=unpermitted, G=general permit, etc. (Use the Remarks columns to record the State permit number, if necessary)

Columns 12-17: Inspection Date. Insert the date entry was made into the facility. Use the year/month/day format (e.g., 04/10/01 = October 01, 2004).

Column 18: Inspection Type*. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the type of inspection:

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----|--|---|---|
| A | Performance Audit | U | IU Inspection with Pretreatment Audit | ! | Pretreatment Compliance (Oversight) |
| B | Compliance Biomonitoring | X | Toxics Inspection | @ | Follow-up (enforcement) |
| C | Compliance Evaluation (non-sampling) | Z | Sludge - Biosolids | { | Storm Water-Construction-Sampling |
| D | Diagnostic | # | Combined Sewer Overflow-Sampling | } | Storm Water-Construction-Non-Sampling |
| F | Pretreatment (Follow-up) | \$ | Combined Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling | : | Storm Water-Non-Construction-Sampling |
| G | Pretreatment (Audit) | + | Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Sampling | ~ | Storm Water-Non-Construction-Non-Sampling |
| I | Industrial User (IU) Inspection | & | Sanitary Sewer Overflow-Non-Sampling | < | Storm Water-MS4-Sampling |
| J | Complaints | \ | CAFO-Sampling | - | Storm Water-MS4-Non-Sampling |
| M | Multimedia | = | CAFO-Non-Sampling | > | Storm Water-MS4-Audit |
| N | Spill | 2 | IU Sampling Inspection | | |
| O | Compliance Evaluation (Oversight) | 3 | IU Non-Sampling Inspection | | |
| P | Pretreatment Compliance Inspection | 4 | IU Toxics Inspection | | |
| R | Reconnaissance | 5 | IU Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment | | |
| S | Compliance Sampling | 6 | IU Non-Sampling Inspection with Pretreatment | | |
| | | 7 | IU Toxics with Pretreatment | | |

Column 19: Inspector Code. Use one of the codes listed below to describe the *lead agency* in the inspection.

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|--|
| A — | State (Contractor) | O — | Other Inspectors, Federal/EPA (Specify in Remarks columns) |
| B — | EPA (Contractor) | P — | Other Inspectors, State (Specify in Remarks columns) |
| E — | Corps of Engineers | R — | EPA Regional Inspector |
| J — | Joint EPA/State Inspectors—EPA Lead | S — | State Inspector |
| L — | Local Health Department (State) | T — | Joint State/EPA Inspectors—State lead |
| N — | NEIC Inspectors | | |

Column 20: Facility Type. Use one of the codes below to describe the facility.

- 1 — Municipal. Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) with 1987 Standard Industrial Code (SIC) 4952.
- 2 — Industrial. Other than municipal, agricultural, and Federal facilities.
- 3 — Agricultural. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 0111 to 0971.
- 4 — Federal. Facilities identified as Federal by the EPA Regional Office.
- 5 — Oil & Gas. Facilities classified with 1987 SIC 1311 to 1389.

Columns 21-66: Remarks. These columns are reserved for remarks at the discretion of the Region.

Columns 67-69: Inspection Work Days. Estimate the total work effort (to the nearest 0.1 work day), up to 99.9 days, that were used to complete the inspection and submit a QA reviewed report of findings. This estimate includes the accumulative effort of all participating inspectors; any effort for laboratory analyses, testing, and remote sensing; and the billed payroll time for travel and pre and post inspection preparation. This estimate does not require detailed documentation.

Column 70: Facility Evaluation Rating. Use information gathered during the inspection (regardless of inspection type) to evaluate the quality of the facility self-monitoring program. Grade the program using a scale of 1 to 5 with a score of 5 being used for very reliable self-monitoring programs, 3 being satisfactory, and 1 being used for very unreliable programs.

Column 71: Biomonitoring Information. Enter D for static testing. Enter F for flow through testing. Enter N for no biomonitoring.

Column 72: Quality Assurance Data Inspection. Enter Q if the inspection was conducted as followup on quality assurance sample results. Enter N otherwise.

Columns 73-80: These columns are reserved for regionally defined information.

Section B: Facility Data

This section is self-explanatory except for "Other Facility Data," which may include new information not in the permit or PCS (e.g., new outfalls, names of receiving waters, new ownership, other updates to the record, SIC/NAICS Codes, Latitude/Longitude).

Section C: Areas Evaluated During Inspection

Check only those areas evaluated by marking the appropriate box. Use Section D and additional sheets as necessary. Support the findings, as necessary, in a brief narrative report. Use the headings given on the report form (e.g., Permit, Records/Reports) when discussing the areas evaluated during the inspection.

Section D: Summary of Findings/Comments

Briefly summarize the inspection findings. This summary should abstract the pertinent inspection findings, not replace the narrative report. Reference a list of attachments, such as completed checklists taken from the NPDES Compliance Inspection Manuals and pretreatment guidance documents, including effluent data when sampling has been done. Use extra sheets as necessary.

*Footnote: In addition to the inspection types listed above under column 18, a state may continue to use the following wet weather and CAFO inspection types until the state is brought into ICIS-NPDES: K: CAFO, V: SSO, Y: CSO, W: Storm Water 9: MS4. States may also use the new wet weather, CAFO and MS4 inspections types shown in column 18 of this form. The EPA regions are required to use the new wet weather, CAFO, and MS4 inspection types for inspections with an inspection date (DTIN) on or after July 1, 2005.

PURPOSE OF INSPECTION

Determination of compliance with the facility's permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and the Clean Water Act

TYPE OF CAFO INSPECTION**UNANNOUNCED**

ANNOUNCED

COMPLAINT

REFERRAL

OTHER

DATE OF INSPECTION: 6/23/16INSPECTION ARRIVAL TIME: 10:30AM INSPECTION DEPARTURE TIME: 12:30PM

INSPECTOR NAME(S) and AFFILIATION(S):

Sandra Brozusky (EPA) and Joe Roberto (EPA)

NAME OF PERSON(S) CREDENTIALS WERE PRESENTED TO:

Ed Blok, Owner and Operator**FACILITY NAME:** Bloks Evergreen Dairy, IncFacility Address: 7768 Beebe RoadCity: Lynden County: _____State: WA Zip Code: 98264Facility Phone Number: (360)354-0510 Fax Number: ()**OWNERS NAME:** Bloks Evergreen Dairy, Inc. (Ed Blok is one of the officers and the point of contact for the inspection).Owners Address: 7768 Beebe RoadMailing Address: 7768 Beebe RoadCity Lynden County: _____State: WA Zip Code: _____Owners Phone Number: (360) 354-0510 Fax Number: ()

OPERATORS NAME: Same as Owner

Operators Address: Same as Owner

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ **County:** _____

State: _____ **Zip Code:** _____

Operators Phone Number: (____) _____ **Fax Number:** (____) _____

TYPE OF FACILITY Dairy Operation Heifer Operation Feedlot Operation Other

How long has this operation been in existence? 1972

What is the name of the nearest surface water? (river, creek, stream, canal)

"LLP ditch" runs through application fields just to the north of the facility. Further north are Scott Ditch and the Nooksack River which also run through and adjacent to application fields.

How far away is the facility from the surface water?

According to Google Earth Pro, the facility is 0.2 miles south of "LLP ditch". Scott Ditch is approximately 0.42 miles north of the facility and the Nooksack River is approximately 0.58 miles north of the facility.

FACILITY SIZE

What is the total acreage of the facility? Approximately 1145 acres.

Spreadable acreage (on facility): Approximately 435 acres are owned and 700 are leased.

ANIMALS ON FACILITY

Total number of animals:

Milkers ~1300
Heifers ~525
Calves ~600

Chickens _____
Beef cattle _____
Other ~140 dry cows

Are animals kept in confinement areas year round? YES NO

How many days per year are animals confined? 365
(CAFO definition: 45 days or more in 12 month period)

PERMIT

Does this facility have a permit? YES NO Permit Number: N/A

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLANDoes the facility have a Nutrient Management Plan? ☒ YES NOWhen was the Nutrient Management Plan last updated? February 2016**FACILITY DISCHARGE**Has the facility ever had any discharges? ☒ YES NO If yes, how many? 1Did you notify anyone? ☒ YES NOWho did you notify? Washington State Department of AgricultureWhen did the discharges occur? Approximately 8 years prior to the inspection**STORAGE LAGOON**How many lagoons do you have? ThreeWhat is the storage capacity? In total, the facility has 8-9 million gallonsIs/are the lagoon(s) lined? Two out of the three lagoons are clay lined.How many days of waste storage capacity does the facility have? Approximately 6 months.Who designed your waste storage lagoon(s)? NRCSDoes the facility have or use a solid separator? ☒ YES NOWhen did you last land apply? The facility was applying liquid waste to an application field at the time of inspection.**WALK-THROUGH INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS:****CONFINEMENT AREAS**Do animals have direct access with surface water? YES ☒ NOIs there any vegetation in the confinement areas? YES ☒ NO Percent with vegetation? 0%**ANIMAL DISPOSAL**

How does the facility dispose of dead animals?

The facility uses a rendering service for Whatcom County. This service will pick up mortalities.

WASTE DISCHARGES OBSERVED

Were any waste discharges observed during the walk through inspection? YES **NO** How many? _____

Did you see any signs of previous areas where waste discharges may have occurred? YES **NO**

Are discharges entering or connected to surface waters of the US? YES **NO**

AREAS OF CONCERN: (e.g., full waste storage ponds, berms, direct access, etc.)

No areas of concern were identified at the time of inspection.

CLOSING CONFERENCE:

We thanked Mr. Blok for his time and corporation with the inspection. We departed the facility at approximately 12:30 PM.

PHOTOGRAPH LOG

Bloks Evergreen Dairy, Inc. (All photographs were taken by Joe Roberto on 6/23/16):



Photo #1: Easterly view of the LLP drainage ditch, running east to west, located north of the facility confinement areas and south of Scott Ditch. Camera photograph #SAM2488.



Photo #2: Southeasterly view of land application occurring in the field just north of the confinement areas at the facility. Camera photograph #SAM2489.



Photo #3: Easterly view of Scott Ditch. Photograph was taken from a bridge over Scott Ditch. Camera photograph #SAM2490.



Photo #4: Westerly view of Scott Ditch. Photograph was taken from a bridge over Scott Ditch. Camera photograph #SAM2491.



Photo #5: Northerly view of the northwestern most lagoon. Camera photograph #SAM2492.



Photo #6: Southerly view of the southwestern most lagoon. Camera photograph #SAM2493.



Photo #7: Northerly view of the easternmost lagoon. Camera photograph #SAM2494.



Photo #8: View of a confinement area at the facility. Camera photograph #SAM2495.

Report Completion Date:

7/25/16

Lead Inspector Signature:

Janet Browney